UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,022	03/22/2006	Kaoru Yokota	2006_0363A	2537

52349   7590   11/05/2010
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P.
1030 15th Street, N.W.
Suite 400 East
Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER
ZECHER, CORDELIA P K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2432	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/05/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
eoa@wenderoth.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/573,022	YOKOTA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cordelia Zecher	2432	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 October 2010</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,7,10-14,18,21-24,29 and 32-41</u> is/are pending in the application.

　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,7,10-14,18,21-24,29 and 32-34</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail. Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed October 14, 2010, with respect to the IDS and 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection under 101 has been withdrawn. All the references cited in the March 22, 2006 IDS have been considered.

2.   Applicant's arguments filed October 14, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Yamada teaches that the physical limitations of a UIM card prevent such storage and it is feasible to only store a small amount of such information. While Yamada does teach to store a small amount of information in the UIM, it does specify that data may be stored on the UIM and does not clarify how much data would be considered a small amount. As such it would still be obvious to modify the access restriction system of Yamada to be embodied on the memory card of McLean.

3.   Applicant argues that the limitations of the claimed judging unit are embodied in the phone of Yamada and not the UIM. However, McLean was cited to teach protecting the record carrier instead of the phone. As such, Yamada in view of McLean teaches all the limitations of the claim.

4.   Applicant argues that Fransdonk fails to teach or suggest transmitting one of the identification information pieces that identifies the record carrier to the access condition management server, and acquires the access condition corresponding to the identification information. However, Fransdonk teaches that when the user makes a

request it includes it's credential and that the access agent evaluates the credential

before providing access (paragraph 83).

5.   Applicant argues that the remaining claims, including withdrawn claims are in

condition for allowance based on the arguments. However, since the arguments are not

persuasive, the claims are not in condition for allowance.

Information Disclosure Statement

6.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on July 23, 2010 was filed

after the mailing date of the non-final rejection on July 15, 2010. The submission is in

compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure

statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

8.   Claims 1 – 3, 7, 10, 21, 22, 35, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Yamada et al's US Publication 2003/0135748 A1, and

further in view of McLean et al's US Patent 5,282,247.

9.   Referring to claim 1, Yamada teaches:

        a.   A storage unit (page 3, paragraph 54).

      b.   A requisition receiving unit operable to receive, from a terminal device having the record carrier attached thereto, a requisition for access to the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 92).

      c.   An acquisition unit operable to acquire an access condition indicating whether or not the terminal device is authorized to access the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 100).

      d.   A judging unit operable to judge, using the processor, whether or not the requisition satisfies the access condition (page 6, paragraph 101).

      e.   A prevention unit operable to prevent the access of the terminal device to the storage unit when the judging unit judges that the requisition does not satisfy the access condition (page 6, paragraph 102).

10.   Yamada does not explicitly disclose the protecting the data stored on the record carrier instead of the phone. However, McLean discloses protecting data stored on a removable storage device against unauthorized access (column 2, lines 52-54). Yamada and McLean are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada and McLean before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada to include the protection of the removable medium of McLean. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to safeguard data stored on a memory card from unauthorized access (column 2, lines 52-54).

11.   Referring to claims 2, 38, and 39, Yamada teaches the acquisition unit acquires
the access condition from the access condition storage unit (page 6, paragraph 101).

12.   Referring to claim 3, Yamada teaches:

        f.   The access condition includes an identifier list including one or more
        identifiers which respectively identify one or more devices authorized to access
        the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 101).

        g.   The requisition includes a requiring device identifier for identifying the
        terminal device (page 6, paragraph 100).

        h.   The judging unit judges that, (i) when an identifier matching the requiring
        device identifier is included in the identifier list, the requisition satisfies the access
        condition (page 6, paragraph 103), and (ii) when an identifier matching the
        requiring device identifier is not included in the identifier list, the requisition unit
        does not satisfy the access condition (page 6, paragraph 102).

13.   Referring to claim 7, Yamada teaches:

        i.   The storage unit stores one or more sets of program data (page 4,
        paragraph 59).

        j.   The access condition includes an identifier list including one or more
        identifiers and one or more sets of program information, which correspond one-
        to-one with the identifiers respectively identifying one or more devices authorized
        to access the storage unit, the sets of program information each indicating one or
        more sets of the program data available for each of the corresponding devices to
        access (page 9, paragraph 143).

k.   The requisition includes a requiring device identifier for identifying the
terminal device and program specifying information for specifying one set of the
program data (page 9, paragraph 142-143).

l.   The judging unit includes:

        i.   A 1st judging subunit operable to judge whether or not an identifier
        matching the requiring device identifier is included in the identifier list
        (page 9, paragraph 144).

        ii.   A 2nd judging subunit operable to judge, when the 1st judging
        subunit judges that the matching identifier is included, whether or not the
        set of program data specified by the program specifying information is
        included in the one or more sets of the program data indicated by a set of
        the program information corresponding to the matching identifier (page 9,
        paragraph 144, page 10, paragraph 152).

        iii.   The judging unit judges that, (i) when either one of a judgment
        result by the 1st judging subunit and a judgment result by the 2nd judging
        subunit is negative, the requisition does not satisfy the access condition
        (page 9, paragraph 145), and (ii) when both the judgment results are
        positive, the requisition satisfies the access condition (page 9, paragraph
        146).

14.   Referring to claim 10, Yamada teaches:

      m.   An access condition accepting unit operable to accept the access condition from a terminal device having the record carrier attached thereto (page 5, paragraph 75).

      n.   An access condition registration unit operable to register, when the terminal device is authorized, the access condition with the access condition storage unit (page 5, paragraph 76).

15.   Referring to claim 21, Yamada teaches:

      o.   A deletion requisition receiving unit operable to receive, from the terminal device having the record carrier attached thereto, a requisition for deletion of the access condition stored by the access condition storage unit (page 15, paragraph 225).

      p.   An access condition deletion unit operable to delete, when the authentication unit authenticates that the terminal device is authorized, the access condition from the access condition storage unit according to the requisition (page 15, paragraph 225).

16.   Yamada does not explicitly disclose authenticating whether or not the deletion is authorized. However, McLean discloses data cannot be erased from memory unless it is first unlocked (column 3, lines 20-24). Yamada and McLean are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada and McLean before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada to include the protection of the removable medium of McLean. The

suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to safeguard data stored on a

memory card from unauthorized access (column 2, lines 52-54).

17.   Referring to claim 22, Yamada teaches:

       q.   An update requisition receiving unit operable to receive, from the terminal

       device having the record carrier attached thereto, a requisition for update of the

       access condition stored by the access condition storage unit (page 15, paragraph

       225).

       r.   An access condition update unit operable to update, when the

       authentication unit authenticates that the terminal device is authorized, the

       access condition from the access condition storage unit according to the

       requisition (page 15, paragraph 225).

18.   Yamada does not explicitly disclose authenticating whether or not the update is

authorized. However, McLean discloses data cannot be read, written nor erased from

memory unless it is first unlocked (column 3, lines 20-24). Yamada and McLean are

analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the

time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art,

having the teachings of Yamada and McLean before him or her, to modify the system of

Yamada to include the protection of the removable medium of McLean. The

suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to safeguard data stored on a

memory card from unauthorized access (column 2, lines 52-54).

19.   Referring to claim 35, Yamada teaches:

       s.   A storage unit (page 3, paragraph 54).

t.   A requisition receiving unit operable to receive, from a terminal device having the record carrier attached thereto, a requisition for access to the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 92) an acquisition unit operable to store the access condition indicating whether or not the terminal device is authorized to access the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 101).

u.   A judging unit operable to judge whether or not the requisition satisfies the access condition (page 6, paragraph 101).

v.   A prevention unit operable to prevent the access of the terminal device to the storage unit when the judging unit judges that the requisition does not satisfy the access condition (page 6, paragraph 102).

w.   A terminal device comprising:

   iv.   A record carrier interface operable to attach the record carrier thereto (Figure 1).

   v.   An access requisition generation unit operable to generate the requisition of the record carrier to the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 92).

   vi.   An access requisition output unit operable to output, to the record carrier, the generated requisition for access (page 6, paragraph 92).

20.   Yamada does not explicitly disclose the protecting the data stored on the record carrier instead of the phone. However, McLean discloses protecting data stored on a removable storage device against unauthorized access (column 2, lines 52-54). Yamada and McLean are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada and McLean before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada to include the protection of the removable medium of McLean. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to safeguard data stored on a memory card from unauthorized access (column 2, lines 52-54).

21.   Claims 11 – 14, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of McLean as applied above, and further in view of Menezes et al's Handbook of Applied Cryptography. Referring to claim 11, Yamada in view of McLean discloses all the limitations of the parent claim, including an encryption key shared with the terminal device (Yamada, page 7, paragraph 114). Yamada in view of McLean does not explicitly disclose using a challenge response to authenticate the terminal device. However, Menezes discloses:

    x.   A 1st key information holding unit holds 1st key information shared with the authorized terminal device (page 400, Challenge-response by symmetric key).

    y.   An output unit operable to output challenge data to the terminal device having the record carrier attached thereto (page 401).

    z.   An examination unit operable to receive response data from the terminal device having the record carrier attached thereto and examine the received response data (page 401).

aa.   The access condition registration unit authenticates that, when, as a result of the examination, the response data is verified as data generated by using the challenge data and the 1st key information, the terminal device having the record carrier attached thereto is the authorized terminal device (page 401).

22.   Yamada in view of McLean and Menezes are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, authentication. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada in view of McLean and Menezes before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada in view of McLean to include the challenge response protocol of Menezes. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been for that the terminal device can prove its identity to the record carrier (page 397, Challenge-response identification).

23.   Referring to claim 12, Yamada teaches:

bb.   The access condition accepting unit accepts the access condition (page 5, paragraph 75).

cc.   The access condition registration unit registers the access condition with the access condition storage unit (page 5, paragraph 76).

24.   Yamada in view of McLean does not explicitly disclose encrypting the access condition, or decrypting it before storage. However, Menezes discloses that entity A signs a message with it's private key, and verifies the signature by decrypting it with A's public key (page 452-453). Yamada in view of McLean and Menezes are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, authentication. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the

teachings of Yamada in view of McLean and Menezes before him or her, to modify the

system of Yamada in view of McLean to include the challenge response protocol of

Menezes. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because DSA is the

U.S. Federal Information Processing Standard (page 452).

25.   Referring to claim 13, Yamada in view of McLean does not explicitly disclose

encrypting the access condition, or decrypting it before storage. However, Menezes

discloses that entity A signs a message with it's private key, and verifies the signature

by decrypting it with A's public key (page 452-453). Yamada in view of McLean and

Menezes are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor,

authentication. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada in view of McLean and

Menezes before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada in view of McLean to

include the challenge response protocol of Menezes. The suggestion/motivation for

doing so would have been because DSA is the U.S. Federal Information Processing

Standard (page 452).

26.   Referring to claim 14, Yamada teaches:

       dd.   The identifier list including one or more identifiers which respectively

       identify one or more devices authorized to access the storage unit (page 6,

       paragraph 101).

27.   Referring to claim 18, Yamada teaches:

       ee.   The storage unit stores one or more sets of program data (page 4,

       paragraph 59).

ff.   The access condition includes an identifier list including one or more

identifiers and one or more sets of program information, which correspond one-

to-one with the identifiers respectively identifying one or more devices authorized

to access the storage unit, the sets of program information each indicating one or

more sets of the program data available for each of the corresponding devices to

access (page 9, paragraph 143).

28.   Claims 23, 24, 29, and 32 – 34, 36, 37, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of McLean as applied above,

and further in view of Fransdonk's US Publication 2003/0167392 A1.

29.   Referring to claim 23, Yamada in view of McLean discloses all the limitations of

the parent claim. Yamada also teaches:

gg.   The access condition includes an identifier list including one or more

identifiers which respectively identify one or more devices authorized to access

the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 101).

hh.   The requisition includes a requiring device identifier for identifying the

terminal device (page 6, paragraph 100).

ii.   The judging unit judges that, (i) when an identifier matching the requiring

device identifier is included in the identifier list, the requisition satisfies the access

condition (page 6, paragraph 103), and (ii) when an identifier matching the

requiring device identifier is not included in the identifier list, the requisition unit

does not satisfy the access condition (page 6, paragraph 102).

30.   Yamada in view of McLean does not explicitly discloses communicating with an

access condition management server, or acquiring the access condition from the

access condition management server using identification information pieces. However,

Fransdonk discloses a condition access agent that securely retrieves and caches the

access criteria (page 4, paragraph 59) and that the agent verifies the request using the

users credentials (paragraph 83). Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk are

analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the

time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art,

having the teachings of Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk before him or her, to

modify the system of Yamada in view of McLean to include the caching access criteria

of Fransdonk. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide

secure content distribution (page 3, paragraph 51).

31.   Referring to claim 24, Fransdonk discloses:

        jj.   A tamper detection unit operable to examine the signature data using a

        verification key relevant to the access condition management server and detect

        whether or not the access condition has been tampered with (page 13,

        paragraph 220).

        kk.   A prohibition unit operable to prohibit, when the tamper detection detects

        that the access condition has been tampered, the judging unit from judging (page

        13, paragraph 221).

32.   Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk are analogous art because they are

from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada in

view of McLean and Fransdonk before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada in

view of McLean to include the digital signature of Fransdonk. The suggestion/motivation

for doing so would have been to secure the access criteria (page 13, paragraph 220).

33.   Referring to claim 29, Yamada teaches:

ll.   The storage unit stores one or more sets of program data (page 4,

paragraph 59).

mm.   The access condition includes an identifier list including one or more

identifiers and one or more sets of program information, which correspond one-

to-one with the identifiers respectively identifying one or more devices authorized

to access the storage unit, the sets of program information each indicating one or

more sets of the program data available for each of the corresponding devices to

access (page 9, paragraph 143).

nn.   The requisition includes a requiring device identifier for identifying the

terminal device and program specifying information for specifying one set of the

program data (page 9, paragraph 142-143).

oo.   The judging unit includes:

vii.   A 1st judging subunit operable to judge whether or not an identifier

matching the requiring device identifier is included in the identifier list

(page 9, paragraph 144).

viii.   A 2nd judging subunit operable to judge, when the 1st judging

subunit judges that the matching identifier is included, whether or not the

set of program data specified by the program specifying information is included in the one or more sets of the program data indicated by a set of the program information corresponding to the matching identifier (page 9, paragraph 144, page 10, paragraph 152).

ix.   The judging unit judges that, (i) when either one of a judgment result by the 1st judging subunit and a judgment result by the 2nd judging subunit is negative, the requisition does not satisfy the access condition (page 9, paragraph 145), and (ii) when both the judgment results are positive, the requisition satisfies the access condition (page 9, paragraph 146).

34.   Referring to claim 32, Fransdonk teaches the acquisition unit acquires, each time when the requisition receiving unit receives the requisition, the access condition from the access condition management server (page 4, paragraph 59). Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada in view of McLean to include the caching access criteria of Fransdonk. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide secure content distribution (page 3, paragraph 51).

35.   Referring to claim 33, Fransdonk teaches the acquisition unit acquires the access condition from the access condition management server at predetermined time intervals (page 13, paragraph 216). Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk are analogous art

because they are from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the time of the

invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the

teachings of Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk before him or her, to modify the

system of Yamada in view of McLean to include the caching access criteria of

Fransdonk. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide secure

content distribution (page 3, paragraph 51).

36.   Referring to claim 34, Fransdonk teaches the acquisition unit acquires, when it is

detected that the record carrier is attached to a terminal device, the access condition

from the access condition management server (page 4, paragraph 59). Yamada in view

of McLean and Fransdonk are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada in view of McLean and

Fransdonk before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada in view of McLean to

include the caching access criteria of Fransdonk. The suggestion/motivation for doing

so would have been to provide secure content distribution (page 3, paragraph 51).

37.   Referring to claim 36, Fransdonk teaches:

        pp.   A storage unit storing therein, in one to one correspondence, identification

        information pieces that respectively identify a plurality of record carriers including

        the record carrier, and a plurality of access conditions including the access

        condition (paragraph 128).

qq.   A reception unit operable to receive, from the terminal device having the record carrier attached thereto, on of the identification information pieces that identifies the record carrier (paragraph 83).

rr.   A registration unit operable to register the access condition corresponding to the received one of the identification information pieces with the access condition storage unit of the record carrier via the terminal device having the record carrier attached thereto (page 4, paragraph 59).

38.   Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada in view of McLean to include the caching access criteria of Fransdonk. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide secure content distribution (page 3, paragraph 51).

39.   Referring to claim 37, Yamada teaches:

ss.   A storage unit (page 3, paragraph 54).

tt.   A requisition receiving unit operable to receive, from a terminal device having the record carrier attached thereto, a requisition for access to the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 92) an acquisition unit operable to store the access condition indicating whether or not the terminal device is authorized to access the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 101).

uu.   A judging unit operable to judge whether or not the requisition satisfies the

access condition (page 6, paragraph 101).

vv.   A prevention unit operable to prevent the access of the terminal device to

the storage unit when the judging unit judges that the requisition does not satisfy

the access condition (page 6, paragraph 102).

ww.   A terminal device comprising:

x.   A record carrier interface operable to attach the record carrier

thereto (Figure 1).

xi.   An access requisition generation unit operable to generate the

requisition of the record carrier to the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 92).

xii.   An access requisition output unit operable to output, to the record

carrier, the generated requisition for access (page 6, paragraph 92).

40.   Yamada does not explicitly disclose the protecting the data stored on the record

carrier instead of the phone. However, McLean discloses protecting data stored on a

removable storage device against unauthorized access (column 2, lines 52-54).

Yamada and McLean are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada and McLean before him

or her, to modify the system of Yamada to include the protection of the removable

medium of McLean. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to

safeguard data stored on a memory card from unauthorized access (column 2, lines 52-

54).

41.   Yamada in view of McLean does not explicitly discloses communicating with an access condition management server, or acquiring the access condition from the access condition management server. However, Fransdonk discloses a condition access agent that securely retrieves and caches the access criteria (page 4, paragraph 59). Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada in view of McLean to include the caching access criteria of Fransdonk. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide secure content distribution (page 3, paragraph 51).

42.   Referring to claims 40 and 41, Yamada teaches:

xx.   Receiving, from a terminal device having the record carrier attached thereto, a requisition for access to the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 92).

yy.   Acquiring an access condition indicating whether or not the terminal device is authorized to access the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 100).

zz.   Judging whether or not the requisition satisfies the access condition (page 6, paragraph 101).

aaa.   Preventing the access of the terminal device to the storage unit when the judging unit judges that the requisition does not satisfy the access condition (page 6, paragraph 102).

bbb.   The access condition includes an identifier list including one or more

identifiers which respectively identify one or more devices authorized to access

the storage unit (page 6, paragraph 101).

ccc.   The requisition includes a requiring device identifier for identifying the

terminal device (page 6, paragraph 100).

ddd.   The judging unit judges that, (i) when an identifier matching the requiring

device identifier is included in the identifier list, the requisition satisfies the access

condition (page 6, paragraph 103), and (ii) when an identifier matching the

requiring device identifier is not included in the identifier list, the requisition unit

does not satisfy the access condition (page 6, paragraph 102).

43.   Yamada does not explicitly disclose the protecting the data stored on the record

carrier instead of the phone. However, McLean discloses protecting data stored on a

removable storage device against unauthorized access (column 2, lines 52-54).

Yamada and McLean are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada and McLean before him

or her, to modify the system of Yamada to include the protection of the removable

medium of McLean. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to

safeguard data stored on a memory card from unauthorized access (column 2, lines 52-

54).

44.   Yamada in view of McLean does not explicitly discloses communicating with an

access condition management server, or acquiring the access condition from the

access condition management server using identification information pieces. However, Fransdonk discloses a condition access agent that securely retrieves and caches the access criteria (page 4, paragraph 59) and that the agent verifies the request using the users credentials (paragraph 83). Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada in view of McLean to include the caching access criteria of Fransdonk. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide secure content distribution (page 3, paragraph 51).

45.   Yamada in view of McLean does not explicitly discloses communicating with an access condition management server, or acquiring the access condition from the access condition management server. However, Fransdonk discloses a condition access agent that securely retrieves and caches the access criteria (page 4, paragraph 59). Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, access control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yamada in view of McLean and Fransdonk before him or her, to modify the system of Yamada in view of McLean to include the caching access criteria of Fransdonk. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide secure content distribution (page 3, paragraph 51).

Conclusion

46.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cordelia Zecher whose telephone number is (571)272-7771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. Z./
Examiner, Art Unit 2432

/Benjamin E Lanier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432